DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 367 332 IR 054 863

AUTHOR Hartmann, Jonathan
TITLE Information Needs of Anthropologists.
PUB DATE Dec 93
NOTE 48p.; M.L.S. Research Paper, Kent State University.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Masters Theses (042) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Libraries; *Anthropology; Citations (References); College Faculty; Higher Education; Information Literacy; *Information Needs; *Information Seeking; Information Services; Online Searching; Online Systems; Questionnaires; Research Libraries; Scholarly Journals; *Search Strategies; *User Needs (Information)
IDENTIFIERS Information Skills; Teacher Surveys

ABSTRACT

Anthropologists at seven universities were surveyed in order to discover the ways in which they go about locating information of value to them; the information sources that they use and that are of the greatest significance to them; the adequacy of the library service being currently provided to anthropologists; and any opinions they have on the subject of their information needs. Results show that anthropologists' information requirements differ somewhat from those of other social scientists. Reference lists in journals and books are often used to locate information sources; journals are the most important information source. Most of the information needs of the majority of respondents are met by their university's library. Older scholars tend to use databases less than younger ones do; online abstracts and indexes are more important to anthropologists than their print versions are. Some respondents express a great desire for a database which would include current references, abstracts, and articles in anthropology. The questionnaire used in the study is included in the appendix. (Contains 20 references.) (Author/JLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

IR

ED 367 332

INFORMATION NEEDS OF ANTHROPOLOGISTS

A Master's Research Paper submitted to the
Kent State University School of Library and Information Science
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree Master of Library Science

by

Jonathan Hartmann

December, 1993

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Jonathan Hartmann
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

12054863

ABSTRACT

Anthropologists at seven universities were surveyed in order to discover: the ways in which they go about locating information of value to them; the information sources that they use and that are of the greatest significance to them; the adequacy of the library service being currently provided to anthropologists; and any opinions they have on the subject of their information needs. Results show that anthropologists' information requirements differ somewhat from those of other social scientists. Reference lists in journals and books are often used to locate information sources; journals are the most important information source. However, cultural anthropologists report that their own field data is their most significant source. Anthropologists use pictorial sources and maps more frequently than social scientists in general do; they also make great use of interlibrary loan. Most of the information needs of the majority of respondents are met by their university's library. Older scholars tend to use databases less than younger ones do; online abstracts and indexes are more important to anthropologists than their print versions are. Some respondents express a great desire for a database which would include current references, abstracts, and articles in anthropology.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....1
Background.....1
Statement of the Problem.....3
Purpose of the Study.....5
Significance of the Study.....6
Limitations.....7
Definitions.....8
Review of the Literature.....9
Methodology.....19
Assumptions.....19
Subject Selection.....19
Instrumentation and Procedures.....20
Statistical Treatment of Data.....20
Results.....21
Summary and Conclusions.....30
Appendix A: Cover Letter.....34
Appendix B: Questionnaire.....35
Endnotes.....38
Bibliography.....41

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Demographic Characteristics of Respondents.....22

Table 2: Respondents by Specialization.....23

Table 3: How Respondents Locate Information Sources.....23

Table 4: Methods of Locating Information by Rank Order.....24

Table 5: Information Sources Used by Respondents.....25

Table 6: Information Sources Used by Rank Order.....26

Table 7: Journals Read by Respondents by Rank Order.....27

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I want to thank Dr. Lois Buttlar, my research adviser, for her encouragement and assistance. I also wish to thank the office personnel of the anthropology departments involved, who were very cooperative and helpful. Finally, I would like to express my gratitude to all of the anthropologists who, through their participation, made this study possible.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background

Anthropology, being the study of man, is concerned with a vast range of subjects. The nature of its primary subdisciplines reflects this: cultural anthropology, which touches upon philosophy, religion and psychology; archaeology, dealing with physical artifacts as well as ancient human living patterns; ethnology, with its close relation to history; linguistics, which is concerned not only with the nature of language itself but with languages in general and the way in which language is acquired in the course of individual human development; and physical or biological anthropology, which includes anatomy, primatology, paleontology, and genetics in its purview.

In recent years, further subdivisions of anthropology have appeared. These include educational anthropology, maritime anthropology, nutritional anthropology, and business anthropology, among others. The proliferation of these subdivisions has broadened anthropology's scope still further.

Anthropologists also study the entire time span of human existence, a period covering thousands of years of recorded history and prehistory. Additionally, anthropologists are interested in a large geographical area, that is, any part of the earth that has been inhabited by man. Anthropology is one of the most international of disciplines in its concerns.

The mammoth scope of the subject has important implications for the situation regarding the information which scholars in the area require. Due to the foregoing facts, information relating to anthropology is widely scattered among a great variety of sources. Such dispersion can, and almost certainly does, make retrieval of information difficult. In addition, due to the extremely international nature of the discipline, some of these sources may be in other languages, or they may be published and distributed outside of the United States, making retrieval and use of their contents even more problematic for the librarian as well as the scholar. As a result of these factors, it appears likely that librarians have been and will continue to be seriously challenged in their attempt to provide satisfactory library service to anthropologists.

A number of studies in the past have focused on the information needs of researchers in the social sciences.[1,2,3] A modicum of data has been collected in these studies, but a large majority of it is only clearly applicable to social scientists in general. In the majority of these studies, the information requirements of scholars in several social science disciplines were examined in conjunction. Analyses of the resulting data were conducted, in which the main thrust of the research was directed toward the evaluation of the information needs of the social scientists as a group.

In at least two previous studies, in the course of data analysis, the data for scholars in each particular discipline was

separated from the results for other disciplines, allowing for limited information to be acquired on the information needs of members of each discipline.[4,5] The data gathered in this manner on anthropologists appears to indicate that their requirements for information, and the methods which they use to obtain it, differ from those of other social scientists.[6,7] However, the data for anthropologists was not rigorously analyzed and evaluated, as anthropologists were not the primary focus of these studies. As a result of the foregoing, very little of the information gathered from past studies specifically addresses the information needs of anthropologists, nor do any of these studies provide a complete or thorough comprehension of the information requirements of anthropologists.

Statement of the Problem

Although it may be the case that anthropologists go about finding information in the same way as other social scientists, this is not known with any certainty. The primary problem investigated was: How do anthropologists conduct the process of gathering the information that they require in the course of the fulfillment of their professional duties? In order to discover this, the first question that needed to be answered was: What methods do anthropologists use in locating desired sources of information for the aforementioned purposes? For example, do they rely primarily on colleagues for advice on where to find an

information source, or are librarians often consulted? Do they use abstracts or indexes to lead them to other sources of information, and, if so, to what extent, and in what formats do they use them? Second, what are the information sources that anthropologists find most useful? Third, do anthropologists typically use sources of information that are to be found in their institution's library? Do they use information sources located outside the library, such as data obtained from attending conferences, to a greater degree than they use information sources which are located in the library? What percentage of their information needs are satisfied by their institution's library?

More specifically, do the information needs of anthropologists specializing in one area of the field differ from those specializing in other areas? For example, do cultural anthropologists and physical anthropologists go about locating information in different ways? Do they use different sources of information? Also, are library resources more valuable to researchers in certain specializations than they are to those specializing in other areas?

Another issue which needed to be addressed was that of the advent of computer technology in libraries, and the effect it may have on the methods used by researchers in locating information. Are scholars able to use this technology, or are they in need of training? Do older scholars avail themselves of this technology less than their younger colleagues, possibly because they came of

age in a time when such technology was unknown, and as a result they are unfamiliar and ill at ease with it? Are available computerized sources such as online and CD-ROM databases good sources of information? Are they up to date and comprehensive in their coverage of material? Have online and CD-ROM indexes and abstracts superseded their print counterparts, or are print sources still heavily used?

The adequacy of the library service being presently provided to anthropologists is another area of concern that this study examines. Previous research has indicated deficiencies in such service regarding social scientists.[8] Are present library services adequate to meet the information needs of anthropologists, or are changes required in order to provide sufficient service? Even if present levels of service are found to be adequate, improvements in service may still be possible. The issue of the quality of service is especially worth examining in an era of reduced library funding, in which shortages of material and staff may reasonably be expected to result in a reduction in the amount and quality of the library service being provided to scholars.

Purpose of the Study

This study examines the information needs of anthropologists in order to discover whether or not researchers in this subject have information needs which differ from those of social

scientists in general, and, if so, in what ways they differ.

Additionally, this research attempts to determine the methods that anthropologists use in locating information of value to them, as well as the information sources that are of greatest significance to this group of scholars. Another objective of the study is to ascertain the present level and adequacy of library service being provided to anthropologists. The ultimate goal of this research is to provide information which can be used by librarians and other information professionals in improving the library service they provide to anthropologists.

Significance of the Study

This study is significant because there is a lack of information available on the nature of the information needs of anthropologists. Earlier studies on the information requirements of social scientists have only peripherally addressed the information needs of anthropologists. The absence of data on this subject makes provision of adequate library service to anthropologists difficult, if not impossible, for librarians. By discovering the specific information requirements of anthropologists, this study is of importance to librarians and other information professionals. It aids in determining if anthropologists require unique information sources and services in order to perform their professional duties, or if they may be served in the same way as social scientists

in general. In addition, by supplying information on the information requirements of members of the major subdisciplines within anthropology, it helps to determine whether anthropologists can be treated as a homogenous group by librarians, or if it is the case that each subdiscipline requires a different type of library service, due to its unique nature.

Limitations

A limitation of this study is that only anthropologists at seven universities in the eastern and midwestern United States were surveyed. Anthropologists employed by universities, colleges, and other educational institutions in other areas of the United States, as well as other parts of the world, were not included in the study. Thus, if anthropologists in other areas differ in some way from those at the institutions surveyed, and as a result have different information needs, this study does not reflect that fact.

In addition, anthropologists who work outside of institutional structures such as universities or other institutions were not included in this study. Similarly, if the information needs of these anthropologists differ from those of anthropology faculty employed at universities, this survey does not indicate this difference.

Definitions

Information needs are defined as any requirements for data or knowledge of any kind which is desirable or necessary to conduct research or teaching.

Anthropologists are defined as holders of faculty positions in departments of anthropology at universities.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

A report prepared by the Graduate Library School and the Division of the Social Sciences of the University of Chicago in 1950 stated that:

> Economists, sociologists, anthropologists, historians and political scientists do not have adequate bibliographical coverage in their own fields. Various kinds of bibliographical services do exist, of course, in all these fields; but they are overlapping, duplicatory, incomplete, without clearly defined boundaries, and generally unsatisfactory.[9]

Of respondents to a questionnaire on the subject, nearly all specialists, approximately 90 percent of a sample of "rank and file" social scientists, 75 percent of a sample of librarians (public, college, university, and research), and about 60 percent of a group of social science "leaders" (association officers and editors) indicated that there was a definite need for additional or improved bibliographical services in the social sciences.[10] Some disciplines, particularly psychology and education, were found to be much better served bibliographically than others. The report also stated that the improvement most desired in bibliographic service by social scientists was the compilation of a series of selective abstracts covering the "best" social science literature. The second most desired improvement was the availability of a series of bibliographical review articles surveying the literature on separate topics in the social sciences.

9.

In their survey of anthropologists, economists, and psychologists, John S. Appel and Ted Gurr report that reference lists appended to books or articles, and bibliographies in journals are the most prevalent sources of useful citations.[11] Colleagues, review articles in books, and consultation with library staff are less significant ways of gathering information. Additionally, only 30.3 percent of researchers report using abstracts regularly. Only 15 percent of anthropologists state that they regularly use abstract journals, as compared to 25 percent of economists and 55 percent of psychologists. Appel and Gurr also state that anthropologists prefer to have bibliographic information arranged by geographic area, and that they desire more bibliographic coverage of foreign language material than psychologists do.

In a study of twenty researchers in the social sciences, L. Uytterschaut reports that literature searching typically begins with scholars locating standard works on the subject, which are usually dated, and which the scholars always desire in book form.[12] Researchers then search for more recent material in various secondary sources, including the major periodicals in the field. Experience in doing research is a deciding factor in the way that searching is undertaken. Inexperienced researchers are much more hesitant about beginning the search than are experienced scholars. The greatest difficulty in locating useful material is caused by the scattering of bibliographic information. Researchers do not desire more assistance from

librarians in finding information, but rather increased centralization of information, which would enable them to conduct more efficient searches on their own.

W. L. Guttsman thinks that university library service in the social sciences is generally regarded as inadequate.[13] This deficiency is even worse in the social sciences than in the natural sciences, due to the fact that in many cases relevant literature in the social sciences is more retrospective and covers a wider range of subject matter, and as a consequence is more difficult to retrieve. According to Guttsman, browsing is a more significant form of information retrieval for social scientists than for scholars in the more exact sciences, since there is a greater need for scholars in the social sciences to "read around the subject."

Regarding bibliographies and abstracts in the social sciences, Guttsman believes that their lack of comprehensiveness is endemic to the subject matter of the disciplines, rather than being a technical fault in their compilation. He also states that journals are required as continuous sources of factual information, and as a result need to be provided in the form of runs or volumes. Guttsman also feels that social scientists may need the services of specialist librarians because of the skill required to locate information which exists in different forms or is found in various sources. He notes the lack of reported use of journals in languages other than English, and attributes this to the researchers' inability to read in other languages.

David N. Wood and Cathryn A. Bower report that social scientists use reference lists and personal contacts to a greater extent than natural scientists do.[14] They also state that social scientists make very little use of foreign language material. In their study of usage of a social science collection, they report that over 98 percent of the requests for social science material are for documents in English. Sixty percent of non-English material used by social scientists is in French. Only in geography is there any appreciable use of foreign language literature. They state that, in general, social scientists utilize personal recommendations, along with citations at the ends of articles and books, in order to locate references to documents of value to them.

Maurice B. Line, in an overview of the INFROSS study, reports that informal channels of locating information are heavily used by social scientists.[15] He also feels that the reported use of informal channels, which is quite high, is lower than their actual use, due to the fact that they are more difficult for scholars to recall using than formal channels are. Among reference sources, bibliographies and reference lists in books or journals were found to be the most useful tools for finding information. Line also states that anthropologists and sociologists are more likely to use books in conjunction, rather than consecutively. Thus, in order for these scholars to be well served, Line thinks that libraries should provide large, open access collections rather than small collections with restricted

access which require the heavy use of interlibrary loan to compensate for their deficiencies.

According to Line, INFROSS indicates that anthropologists use books or monographs more often than any other type of social scientist. Fifty-seven percent of anthropologists report using monographs often. In addition, anthropologists and geographers are the heaviest users of pictorial sources other than films, with 2 percent of this group stating that they use such sources often. Only 6 percent of social scientists make use of pre-1800 materials; of those that do, the heaviest users are historians, geographers, and anthropologists. The use of older books is negatively related to the use of statistical material. Overall, although 84 percent of social scientists think it is moderately or very important that they be aware of what is being published very soon after publication, anthropologists, historians, and statisticians are the least concerned with this issue. Anthropologists and historians are also the most tolerant of all social scientists regarding the delay involved between the publication of an item and its appearance in an indexing or abstracting journal.

Regarding foreign language material, items in French are by far the most used, with 75 percent of all social scientists reading French language material. However, only a third of those who are capable of reading in a foreign language regularly read items in that language. Line concludes from this that there is a serious foreign language problem in the social sciences.

13.

A study by the National Enquiry into Scholarly Communication finds that researchers in the social sciences rely heavily on personal collections, and rarely complain about a lack of reference tools in their respective fields.[16]

In a study of serial use by social science faculty, Patricia Stenstrom and Ruth B. McBride report that nearly all faculty members read journals regularly, with 67 percent reading at least one journal in the library's collection.[17] When desired items are unavailable locally, 68 percent of researchers usually or occasionally abandon the search entirely. Of those that continue to pursue the material, most borrow items from a colleague or secure reprints, rather than use interlibrary loan. Stenstrom and McBride also state that faculty use the library merely to supplement their own collections of serials.

Susan Baughman reports in her survey of humanists, including anthropologists, that 70 percent of respondents are satisfied with the speed with which important items are brought to their attention.[18] She also states that the average humanist conducts from four to five literature searches per year in the library, during the course of which a librarian is only rarely consulted. Humanists also express satisfaction with interlibrary loan, as long as requested materials do not take more than three weeks to arrive.

In an examination of studies of the invisible college phenomenon, Blaise Cronin comments that:

Social scientists are a more variegated population than

> physical or natural scientists. The data and information needs of social scientists vary from subject to subject. For psychologists, economists, sociologists, anthropologists, political scientists, educationalists and legal researchers, information has a variety of meanings and forms (e.g. published research results, experimental data, time series, field work findings, data files, archival data, precedents, patent information, original manuscripts, oral history) and it seems reasonable to assume that the kind of information that is required, the ease with which it can be accessed and the use to which it is likely to be put will have a direct bearing on the way in which interpersonal networks are developed and relied upon. It may be that generalizations about invisible colleges are ill-advised as regards the social sciences, and a number of comparative studies to identify the particular information needs and information-seeking habits of different categories of social scientists could profitably be instituted.[19]

In a study of the information seeking behavior of doctoral candidates in the social sciences in India, T. Subrahmanyam reports that 59 percent use the subject catalog to identify relevant works, while the remaining 41 percent go directly to the shelves to browse for them.[20] Following up citations obtained from such works is the most popular method of continuing the search. Theses are regarded by researchers as the single most useful source of information. Only researchers in psychology were found to use abstracts and indexes. The university library is the main source used to locate pertinent documents. Although the library is a significant source of information for these researchers, other sources such as experts, colleagues, and research supervisors are also regarded as being important.

Stephen A. Roberts states that research has shown that secondary processing of information is needed.[21] An example of

such processing is the creation of literature reviews by librarians for researchers' use. Roberts also thinks that a shift away from mere provision of material toward query answering is necessary, if the information needs of social scientists are to be met.

According to J. Michael Brittain, social scientists resist using library and bibliographical services, and although they do utilize some secondary services, they tend to ignore the primary literature in their fields.[22] He believes that their information seeking behavior is haphazard. Referring to the library service provided to social scientists, he states that information providers must do more than simply supply bibliographical references. In his view, librarians need to place greater emphasis on how information is used, once it has been acquired.[23]

Donald Owen Case asserts that studies on information needs and uses rarely examine the intervening stage between the gathering of significant information and the use of same.[24] Case studied the storage and organization of documents in the offices of humanists and social scientists. He discovered that social scientists tend to have more of every type of printed material in their offices than humanists do, although he speculates that this may simply be due to the fact that humanists keep more material which is relevant to their work at home. In addition, Case finds no great differences in information storage and organization within fields in the social sciences.

Jitka Hurych speculates that social scientists use online

sources more than natural scientists do because the information which is of value to them is scattered among a great number of journals.[25]

Kathleen Heim asserts that the growing importance of the data archive reflects the increasing emphasis on quantitative and empirical methods of research in the social sciences in recent years.[26]

S. P. Agrawal and M. Lal, in a study of the information needs of social scientists in India, report that books are the main source of primary information for social scientists.[27] In regard to information services, researchers generally want short bibliographies of items in their area of interest. It is often very difficult for scholars to locate items listed in available bibliographies. Agrawal and Lal also state that the majority of inexperienced researchers are deficient in their knowledge of research techniques, and can benefit from training in research methodology. Such training can be accomplished through a combination of aid from experts and library practice.

According to Agrawal and Lal, translation sources are not much desired by social scientists in India. They base this assertion on the fact that only a few non-English journal titles are received by libraries in Delhi. They also claim that the information needs of social scientists are being satisfied in India, due in part to the existence of APINESS (Asia Pacific Network in the Social Sciences), which coordinates the activities of information centers in participating countries.

Margaret Slater finds that academic social scientists are still being better served than applied social scientists, but that even service to academics has declined in recent years.[28] She also states that problems exist with regard to physical access to information, a situation which has been reported by earlier researchers as well. These problems are being exacerbated by a worsening economic situation and the consequent lack of funds, time, and staff amongst both information providers and users.

Mary B. Folster reports that journals are social scientists' primary information source, and that tracking of citations is an often used method of searching for information.[29] Folster also states that although computerized literature searching is not an important method of gathering data for them, researchers claim that they will use computer access more if they are trained in its use. In addition, aside from the fact that graduate students consult librarians more often, Folster asserts that faculty and graduate students in the social sciences can be treated as a homogenous group for the purposes of research.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Assumptions

It is assumed that anthropology faculty at the seven universities selected for use in the study are generally similar (in respects which are related to the performance of their professional duties) to anthropologists employed elsewhere, and as a result have similar requirements for information, and use similar methods in obtaining information.

Subject Selection

Anthropologists were located by referring to Peterson's Guide to Graduate Programs in the Humanities and Social Sciences 1993, and determining seven universities in the eastern and midwestern United States which have masters and/or doctoral programs in anthropology. These institutions are: Case Western Reserve University; Kent State University; the Ohio State University; the University of Pennsylvania; the University of Michigan; Indiana University at Bloomington; and the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Each of these universities employs a number of anthropologists. Precise numbers of full time anthropology faculty at each university, with the exception of Kent State University, are listed in the directory. The number of anthropology faculty employed at Kent State was

ascertained by contacting the department.

Instrumentation and Procedures

Survey methodology was employed in the study. The survey instrument was a questionnaire (see Appendix A), 151 of which were mailed or personally delivered by the researcher to the anthropology departments of the seven universities selected for use in the study. The questionnaires, accompanied by a cover letter (see Appendix B), were subsequently placed in faculty mailboxes by departmental secretaries (who had been contacted earlier and had agreed to perform this service).

Due to a low response rate (only 50 anthropologists completed and returned the first set of questionnaires), a follow up was conducted 23 days later in which another 151 questionnaires were sent in the same fashion to the departments.

Statistical Treatment of Data

The data received was tabulated and analyzed using descriptive statistical methods.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Of the 151 questionnaires delivered, 72 were returned, for a response rate of 48 percent. Of those returned, 70 (47%) were returned in time to be used in the study.

Demographics

The typical respondent is a male associate professor between the ages of 40 and 49, who holds a Ph.D degree (see Table 1). However, many respondents differ in one or more ways from this categorization. Substantial numbers (24 or 36.4%) are female. Twenty-two (31.9%) are full professors; 17 (24.6%) are assistant professors. A large number of respondents are either over 49 (34.4%), or under 40 (25.7%) years of age. The vast majority (64 or 94.1%) hold the Ph.D degree. Two respondents hold a master's degree; one respondent holds a bachelor's degree, and one holds the J.D degree.

Specialization

Respondents are fairly evenly divided among three areas (see Table 2). Most (22 or 32.8%) are cultural anthropologists; nearly as many (21 or 31.3%) specialize in physical or biological anthropology; slightly fewer (19 or 28.4%) specialize in archaeology or prehistory. Only two respondents specialize in linguistics; two others are ethnologists, and one is a medical anthropologist.

Table 1

Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

Characteristic	n	f	%
Age	70		
20-29		1	1.4
30-39		17	24.3
40-49		28	40.0
50-59		13	18.6
60-69		9	12.9
Over 69		2	2.9
Total		70	100.0
Gender	66		
Male		42	63.6
Female		24	36.4
Total		66	100.0
Highest Ed. Degree	68		
B.A.		1	1.5
M.A.		2	2.9
Ph.D		64	94.1
J.D		1	1.5
Rank	69		
Research Assoc.		3	4.3
Instructor		2	2.9
Asst. Professor		17	24.6
Assoc. Professor		25	36.2
Professor		22	31.9
Total		69	100.0

Locating Information

Reference lists in journals and books are the most prevalent means used by respondents to locate information sources (see

Table 2

Respondents by Specialization

Area (n = 67)	f	%
Cultural	22	32.8
Archaeology or Prehistory	19	28.4
Physical or Biological	21	31.3
Linguistics	2	3.0
Ethnology	2	3.0
Other	1	1.5
Total	67	100.0

Table 3

How Respondents Locate Information Sources

Method (n = 70)	f	%
Abstracts/indexes (print)	37	52.9
Abstracts/indexes (CD-ROM)	16	22.9
Abstracts/indexes (online)	36	51.4
Library catalogs	40	57.1
Reference lists in journals	67	95.7
Reference lists in books	66	94.3
Bibliographies	57	81.4
Book reviews	58	82.9
Consult expert	27	38.6
Ask librarian	21	30.0
Ask colleague	43	61.4
Browse shelves	47	67.1
Other	12	17.1

Table 3). Sixty-seven (95.7%) respondents report using reference lists in journals, while 66 (94.3%) use reference lists in books to locate information sources. Book reviews and bibliographies are the next most often utilized location aids, with 58 (82.9%) respondents using book reviews and 57 (81.4%) consulting

Table 4

Methods of Locating Information by Rank Order

Method	Ranking 1	2	3	Total
Ref. lists in journals	33	11	6	50
Ref. lists in books	6	24	6	36
Bibliographies	9	8	10	27
Abstracts/ind. (online)	6	4	7	17
Book reviews	4	5	8	17
Library catalogs	3	4	4	11
Ask colleague	0	5	6	11
Browse shelves	1	1	7	9
Abstracts/ind. (print)	4	2	2	8
Other	2	1	4	7

bibliographies.

When asked to rank aids for locating information sources in the order of their importance, respondents overwhelmingly choose reference lists in journals as the most significant aid, with 33 respondents rating them as the most important aid (see Table 4). Reference lists in books are mentioned by 36 respondents; bibliographies are noted by 27 respondents.

Information Sources

All respondents use journals as sources of information (see Table 5). Sixty-four (94.1%) use monographs; the same number use their own field data. Personal collections are the next most often used source, with 63 (92.6%) respondents using them.

When asked to rank information sources in the order of their importance, respondents select journals as the single most

Table 5

Information Sources Used by Respondents

Source	(n = 68)	f	%
Library catalog		49	72.1
Librarian		24	35.3
CD-ROM databases		14	20.6
Online databases		40	58.8
Journals		68	100.0
Monographs		64	94.1
Dissertations		55	80.9
Colleagues		52	76.5
Personal collection		63	92.6
Maps		33	48.5
Own field data		64	94.1
Conferences		45	66.2
Unpublished research data		37	54.4
Videos/films		16	23.5
Photographs/illustrations		28	41.2
Archives		23	33.8
Government documents		25	36.8
Special collections		23	33.8
Sound recordings		7	10.3
Newspapers		19	27.9
Pamphlets		10	14.7
Abstracts		23	33.8

important source of information (see Table 6). Twenty-seven respondents indicate journals are the most important information source. Respondents' own field data is ranked as the most important source by 16 respondents; personal collections are designated as the most important source by 8 respondents. Differences in the importance of information sources between specializations are apparent. Fifty percent of respondents specializing in cultural anthropology rate their own field data as their most important source of information. In contrast,

Table 6

Information Sources Used by Rank Order

Source	Ranking 1	2	3	Total
Journals	27	16	7	50
Own field data	16	11	6	33
Monographs	2	13	12	27
Personal collection	8	11	7	26
Online databases	0	3	9	12
Library catalog	5	0	3	8
Colleagues	0	3	5	8
Unpub. research data	3	1	2	6
Conferences	1	0	3	4

archaeologists and physical anthropologists indicate journals are their most significant source of information, with 36.8 percent of archaeologists and 61.9 percent of physical anthropologists ranking journals first among sources in importance.

Journals Read

Respondents were asked to list the journals that they use in the order of their importance to them (see Table 7). Respondents report that they read a total of 98 journal titles. Five of these are particularly significant to respondents: American Antiquity; American Anthropologist; Current Anthropology; American Journal of Physical Anthropology; and American Ethnologist. Current Anthropology may be somewhat less significant to respondents than the other four journals mentioned, as it is listed as the most important journal on only one occasion.

Table 7

Journals Read by Respondents by Rank Order

Journal	Ranking 1	2	3	4	Total
American Antiquity	11	3	2	3	19
Amer. Anthropologist	9	4	2	4	19
Current Anthropology	1	6	5	6	18
Amer. J. of Phys. Anth.	11	2	1	3	17
Amer. Ethnologist	9	0	5	3	17
Man	0	3	2	2	7
Science	0	2	1	3	6
J. of Human Evolution	0	1	4	0	5
Amer. J. of Human Bio.	0	1	4	0	5
Cultural Anthropology	0	1	3	1	5
Amer. J. of Primatology	2	2	0	0	4
J. of Asian Studies	1	2	1	0	4
Africa	1	2	0	1	4
Amer. J. of Clin. Nutr.	3	0	0	0	3
Soc. Sci. and Medicine	2	1	0	0	3
Antiquity	2	0	1	0	3
Nature	1	2	0	0	3
Anth. Quarterly	0	3	0	0	3
Signs	0	0	2	1	3

Of particular interest is the fact that although some titles are rarely mentioned by respondents, these same titles are occasionally ranked as the most important journals.

Languages

Respondents to the survey report reading the anthropological literature in 16 languages in addition to English. Only 9 (12.9%) respondents do not report reading in another language. French is the most frequently read of these, with 43 (61.4%) respondents reading the literature in French. Other languages

read include: Spanish (28 or 40%); German (14 or 20%); Portuguese (6 or 8.6%); and Italian (5 or 7.1%). Two (2.9%) respondents read in each of the following languages; Chinese, Russian, and Korean. Each of the following languages is read by one (1.4%) respondent; Dogon, Dutch, Hebrew, Indonesian, Japanese, Modern Greek, Nepali, and Norwegian.

Library Use

The largest group of respondents (27 or 40.9%) report that their institution's library satisfies between 75 percent and 100 percent of their information needs. Nineteen (28.8%) report that their library satisfies between 51 and 75 percent of their needs; 20 (30.3%) indicate that less than 51 percent of their needs are satisfied by their university's library.

When asked how many hours per week they typically use their institution's library, a clear majority (51 or 76.1%) report that they use the library from one to four hours per week. The second largest group (12 or 17.9%) indicate they typically use the library between five and eight hours per week.

Respondents were asked whether they generally conduct the majority of their preparation for teaching or research themselves, or if they delegate this duty to graduate assistants, librarians, or other individuals. All respondents report that they conduct the majority of their preparation for research themselves; almost all (67 or 98.5%) perform the majority of their preparation for teaching personally.

When asked what they usually do when needed materials are unavailable in their institution's library, most respondents (62 or 89.9%) report using interlibrary loan.

In response to a question concerning the organization of library materials in their field, 41 (60.3%) respondents indicate that such materials are mostly well organized and easy to find. When asked whether bibliographic abstract sources in anthropology lack comprehensive, international access to the literature, 38 (64.4%) indicate that this is either completely or mostly true. Fifty-four (93.1%) respondents indicate that when using books, they typically use them in conjunction, rather than consecutively.

Database Use

Use of computerized databases appears to be related to the user's age. The older the respondent is, the less likely he or she is to use databases to locate information sources. This is true for both CD-ROM and online databases. In the case of online databases, most (12 or 70.6%) of the respondents between the ages of 30 and 39 use them to locate information sources. Approximately half (15 or 53.6%) of those aged 40 to 49 do so. Fewer (6 or 46.2%) of those aged 50 to 59 use this method. Of those over 59, very few (2 or 22.2%) use online databases for this purpose.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Anthropologists responding to the survey are typically associate professors who possess a Ph.D degree in anthropology. Although most respondents are male, a substantial number are female.

The great majority of respondents prefer using reference lists in journals and books to locate sources of information. Journals are the most significant source of information for anthropologists responding to the survey, a finding which Folster[30] also reports to be true for social scientists in general. Monographs (books) and field data are next in importance; personal collections are also a significant source. Maps appear to be used by a relatively high percentage of anthropologists. A significant number of respondents report using videos or films; nearly half use illustrations or photographs. This finding is in accord with earlier research which finds anthropologists to be among the heaviest users of pictorial sources.[31]

Cultural anthropologists report that their own field data is their most significant source of information; in contrast, archaeologists and physical anthropologists rely more on journals for needed information. Although a core of five journals are the most heavily read titles, a wide range of journals are used by respondents.

Respondents read the literature of their field in a wide

30.

variety of languages; few report that they read only in English.

The preponderance of the information needs of respondents are satisfied by their university's library; however, this is not the case for a significant number of these scholars (one respondent, a physical anthropologist, comments that the library holds few items of interest besides journals). In contrast to the findings of previous research concerning social scientists,[32] anthropologists appear to be heavy users of interlibrary loan.

Survey respondents report that they feel that library materials in their field are mostly well organized and easy to retrieve. A majority find bibliographic tools in anthropology wanting, a finding supported by previous research.[33] When using books, respondents typically use them in conjunction, rather than singly.

Rather frequent use of databases, particularly of the online variety, is reported by respondents. Predictably, older researchers report utilizing such tools less often than younger ones do.

Some respondents commented that they greatly desire the creation of a database which would contain the following: anthropology abstracts; current references in all subdisciplines of anthropology and related disciplines; and all major articles and book chapters on the subject.

In conclusion, anthropologists appear to have information needs which differ in certain respects from those of social

scientists in general. Due to the lack of precise measurement in previous research in the area, exact comparisons are difficult to make. Anthropologists appear to use their own field data, pictorial sources, maps, and monographs more than other social scientists do; they also report using interlibrary loan to a greater extent. There is a significant difference between the information needs of anthropologists specializing in different areas of the subject. Few anthropologists report reading in English only; anthropologists appear to read the literature in other languages more often than social scientists in general do. Online abstracts and indexes appear to be more important to anthropologists than their print counterparts are.

The library service currently being provided to anthropologists is of questionable quality. While the majority appear to be reasonably well served, a significant number do not make much use of their institution's library, and certain library materials, such as bibliographical aids, are not very useful. Judging from the comments made by some respondents, there is a lack of information available in database format which is greatly needed.

These results indicate that librarians can better serve anthropologists in several ways. They can include in their library collections a wide variety of journals (including those in languages other than English), especially the five core journals in the subject. They may purchase greater numbers of and/or higher quality pictorial sources, maps, and monographs

relating to anthropology, including those in languages other than English. They can encourage producers of bibliographies and databases to create products which are suitable for anthropologists and/or select bibliographies and databases by this criterion. They can provide older scholars with training in the use of computer technology. Finally, they can make interlibrary loan more readily available and easier to use; however, the great use which anthropologists reportedly make of interlibrary loan may be seen as an indication that the local collection is wanting and in need of improvement.

APPENDIX A: Cover Letter

School of Library and Information Science
(216) 672-2782
Fax 216-672-7965

Kent STATE UNIVERSITY
P. O. Box 5190 Kent, Ohio 44242-0001

INFORMATION NEEDS OF ANTHROPOLOGISTS

August 30, 1993

Dear Scholar:

I am conducting a survey of the information needs of anthropologists. The purpose of this research is to discover the ways that anthropologists go about locating information of value to them in their research and teaching. This data can then be used by librarians in improving the library service they provide to this group of scholars.

Your responses to the questions on the enclosed questionnaire are anonymous, as you need not sign your name. Additionally, your responses are entirely confidential, because only the researcher will have access to them. There is no penalty of any kind for refusing to participate in the study, nor is there any penalty for withdrawing from participation at any time.

If you want to know more about this research project, please call me at (216) 672-7374, or Dr. Lois Buttlar, my research advisor, at (216) 672-2782. This project has been approved by Kent State University. If you have questions about Kent State University's rules for research, please call Dr. Eugene Wenninger, telephone (216) 672-2070. Upon completion of the study a copy of the results will be available upon request.

Sincerely,

Jonathan Hartmann

Jonathan Hartmann
Graduate Student
School of Library and Information Science
Kent State University

APPENDIX B: Questionnaire

INFORMATION NEEDS OF ANTHROPOLOGISTS

1. Your age:

__ 20-29 __ 30-39 __ 40-49
__ 50-59 __ 60-69 __ 70 or over

2. Gender: __ male __ female

3. Highest educational degree held:

__ Bachelor's Major _____
__ Master's Major _____
__ Ph.D Major _____

4. Title or rank:

__ Master's student __ Doctoral student __ Instructor
__ Asst. Professor __ Assoc. Professor __ Professor

5. Area of specialization:

__ Cultural __ Linguistics
__ Archaeology or Prehistory __ Ethnology
__ Physical or Biological __ Other _____

6. In what languages, besides English, do you read the anthropological literature?

_____ _____

_____ _____

7. Indicate all of the ways you go about <u>locating</u> information sources for your teaching and/or research.

__ abstracts/indexes (print format) __ bibliographies
__ abstracts/indexes (CD-ROM format) __ book reviews
__ abstracts/indexes (online) __ consult expert
__ library catalogs __ ask librarian
__ reference lists in journals __ ask colleague
__ reference lists in books __ browse shelves
__ other _____

8. From the above list, which three strategies do you use the most frequently or are the most important to you. Please list in rank order of importance.

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

9. How many hours per week do you typically use your institution's library?

__ 0 __ 1-4 __ 5-8 __ 9-12 __ 13-16 __ Over 16

10. Who generally conducts the majority of your preparation for research?

__ self __ grad. asst. __ librarian __ other _____

11. Who generally conducts the majority of your preparation for research?

__ self __ grad asst. __ librarian __ other _____

12. Indicate all of the following information sources that you typically use in your work.

__ library catalog
__ librarian
__ CD-ROM databases
__ online databases
__ journals
__ monographs
__ dissertations
__ colleagues
__ personal collection
__ maps
__ own field data
__ conferences
__ unpublished research data
__ videos/films
__ photographs/illustrations
__ archives
__ government documents
__ special collections
__ sound recordings
__ newspapers
__ pamphlets
__ abstracts

13. From the above list, which three sources do you use the most frequently or are the most important to you? Please list in rank order.

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

14. If a desired source of information is unavailable in your institution's library, what do you usually do next?

__ abandon search
__ borrow material from colleague
__ other _____
__ secure reprints
__ interlibrary loan

15. Do you feel that library materials in your field are well organized and easy to find?

__ yes, completely __ mostly __ somewhat __ not at all

16. Do you feel that bibliographic abstract sources in your field lack comprehensive, international access to the literature?

__ yes, completely __ mostly __ somewhat __ not at all

17. Please list the journals you use in the order of their importance to you:

1. _____ 2. _____

3. _____ 4. _____

18. When using books (monographs) in your research, do you typically use them consecutively, or do you use them in conjunction?

__ consecutively __ in conjunction

19. What percentage of your information needs are satisfied by your institution's library?

__ 0% __ 1-10% __ 11-25%
__ 26-50% __ 51-75% __ 76-100%

20. Please feel free to use the reverse side of this sheet to add any additional comments or opinions you may have with respect to the information needs of anthropologists.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION

Returning this questionnaire implies that you have consented to participate in this study. Please place the questionnaire in the enclosed stamped, addressed envelope, and mail within ten days of receipt to:

Jonathan Hartmann
Graduate Student
Leebrick Hall
Kent State University
Kent, Ohio 44242

37.

ENDNOTES

1. W. L. Guttsman, "The Literature of the Social Sciences and Provision for Research in Them," The Journal of Documentation 22, 3 (September 1966): 186-194.

2. David N. Wood and Cathryn A. Bower, "The Use of Social Science Periodical Literature," The Journal of Documentation 25, 2 (June 1969): 108-122.

3. S. P. Agrawal and M. Lal, "Information Needs of Social Scientists," International Library Review 19, 3 (July 1987): 287-299.

4. Maurice B. Line, "Information Users and Needs of Social Scientists: An Overview of INFROSS," ASLIB Proceedings 23 (August 1971): 412-433.

5. John S. Appel and Ted Gurr, "Bibliographic Needs of Social and Behavioral Scientists," American Behavioral Scientist 7, 10 (June 1964): 51-54.

6. Maurice B. Line, "Information Users and Needs of Social Scientists," 412-433.

7. John S. Appel, "Bibliographic Needs of Social and Behavioral Scientists," 51-54.

8. L. Uytterschaut, "Literature Searching Methods in Social Science Research: A Pilot Inquiry," American Behavioral Scientist 9, 9 (May 1966): 14-26.

9. Graduate Library School and the Division of the Social Sciences of the University of Chicago, "Bibliographical Services in the Social Sciences," Library Quarterly 20, 2 (April 1950): 80.

10. Ibid., 79-100.

11. John S. Appel, "Bibliographic Needs of Social and Behavioral Scientists," 51-54.

12. L. Uytterschaut, "Literature Searching Methods in Social Science Research," 14-26.

13. W. L. Guttsman, "The Literature of the Social Sciences and Provision for Research in Them," 186-194.

14. David N. Wood and Cathryn A. Bower, "The Use of Social Science Periodical Literature," 108-122.

15. Maurice B. Line, "Information Users and Needs Of Social Scientists," 412-433.

16. National Enquiry Into Scholarly Communication, Scholarly Communication: The Report of the National Enquiry (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1979).

17. Patricia Stenstrom and Ruth B. McBride, "Serial Use by Social Science Faculty: A Survey," College and Research Libraries 40, 5 (September 1979): 426-431.

18. Susan Baughman, "Information Materials and Library Use by Academic Sponsored Researchers in the Social Sciences," (Ph.D Diss., Simmons College, 1981) Dissertation Abstracts International 43, 1733A.

19. Blaise Cronin, "Invisible Colleges and Information Transfer: A Review and Commentary With Particular Reference to the Social Sciences," The Journal of Documentation 38, 3 (1982): 230.

20. T. Subrahmanyam, "A Study of Information Seeking Behavior of Doctoral Candidates in the Social Sciences," Herald of Library Science 3-4 (July-October 1983): 200-204.

21. Stephen A. Roberts, "The Management and Development of Information and Library Provision in the Social Sciences," The Journal of Documentation 40 (June 1984): 94-119.

22. J. Michael Brittain, "Relevance of Social Science Output Worldwide," International Social Science Journal 37, 2 (1985): 267.

23. J. Michael Brittain, "Information Services and Knowledge Creation in the Social Sciences," International Social Science Journal 38, 4 (1986): 634.

24. Donald Owen Case, "Collection and Organization of Written Information by Social Scientists and Humanists: An Exploratory Study," Journal of Information Science 12, 3 (1986): 97-104.

25. Jitka Hurych, "After Bath: Scientists, Social Scientists and Humanists in the Context of Online Searching," The Journal of Academic Librarianship 12, 3 (July 1986): 158-165.

26. Kathleen Heim, "Social Scientific Information Needs for Numeric Data: The Evolution of the International Data Archive Infrastructure," Collection Management 9, 1 (Spring 1987): 1-53.

27. S. P. Agrawal and M. Lal, "Information Needs of Social Scientists," 287-299.

28. Margaret Slater, "Social Scientists Information Needs in the 1980's," The Journal of Documentation 44 (Summer 1988): 226-237.

29. Mary B. Folster, "A Study of the Use of Information Sources by Social Science Researchers," The Journal of Academic Librarianship 15, 1 (March 1989): 7.

30. Ibid.

31. Maurice B. Line, "Information Users and Needs of Social Scientists," 417.

32. Patricia Stenstrom, "Serial Use by Social Science Faculty," 429-430.

33. Graduate Library School and the Division of the Social Sciences of the University of Chicago, "Bibliographical Services in the Social Sciences," 80.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Agrawal, S. P., and M. Lal. "Information Needs of Social Scientists." International Library Review 19, 3 (July 1987): 287-299.

Appel, John S., and Ted Gurr. "Bibliographic Needs of Social and Behavioral Scientists." American Behavioral Scientist 7, no. 10 (June 1964): 51-54.

Baughman, Susan. "Information Materials and Library Use by Academic Sponsored Researchers in the Social Sciences." (Ph.D Diss., Simmons College, 1981.) Dissertation Abstracts International 43, 1733A.

Brittain, J. Michael. "Information Services and Knowledge Creation in the Social Sciences." International Social Science Journal 38, 4 (1986): 631-641.

Brittain, J. Michael. "Relevance of Social Science Output Worldwide." International Social Science Journal 37, 2 (1985): 259-275.

Case, Donald Owen. "Collection and Organization of Written Information by Social Scientists and Humanists: An Exploratory Study." Journal of Information Science 12, 3 (1986): 97-104.

Cronin, Blaise. "Invisible Colleges and Information Transfer: A Review and Commentary With Particular Reference to the Social Sciences." The Journal of Documentation 38, 3 (1982): 212-236.

Folster, Mary B. "A Study of the Use of Information Sources by Social Science Researchers." The Journal of Academic Librarianship 15 (March 1989): 7-11.

Graduate Library School and the Division of the Social Sciences of the University of Chicago. "Bibliographical Services in the Social Sciences." Library Quarterly 20, 2 (April 1950): 79-100.

Guttsman, W. L. "The Literature of the Social Sciences and Provision for Research in Them." The Journal of Documentation 22, 3 (September 1966): 186-194.

Heim, Kathleen. "Social Scientific Information Needs for Numeric Data: The Evolution of the International Data Archive Infrastructure." Collection Management 9, 1 (Spring 1987): 1-53.

Hurych, Jitka. "After Bath: Scientists, Social Scientists, and Humanists in the Context of Online Searching." The Journal of Academic Librarianship 12, 3 (July 1986): 158-165.

Line, Maurice B. "Information Users and Needs of Social Scientists: An Overview of INFROSS." ASLIB Proceedings 23 (August 1971): 412-433.

National Enquiry Into Scholarly Communication. Scholarly Communication: The Report of the National Enquiry. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1979.

Roberts, Stephen A. "The Management and Development of Information and Library Provision in the Social Sciences." The Journal of Documentation 40 (June 1984): 94-119.

Slater, Margaret. "Social Scientists' Information Needs in the 1980's." The Journal of Documentation 44 (Summer 1988): 226-237.

Stenstrom, Patricia and Ruth B. McBride. "Serial Use by Social Science Faculty: A Survey." College and Research Libraries 40, 5 (September 1979): 426-431.

Subrahmanyam, T. "A Study of Information Seeking Behavior of Doctoral Candidates in the Social Sciences." Herald of Library Science 22, 3-4 (July-October 1983): 200-204.

Uytterschaut, L. "Literature Searching Methods in Social Science Research: A Pilot Inquiry." American Behavioral Scientist 9, no. 9 (May 1966): 14-26.

Wood, David N. and Cathryn A. Bower. "The Use of Social Science Periodical Literature." The Journal of Documentation 25, no. 2 (June 1969): 108-122.